RPM SUMMER INSTITUTE 2012:

ORGANIZATIONAL AND DEPARTMENTAL CONTEXT (CULTURE) SGD NOTES

**1) Create and sustain will to improve:**

Motivation:

* Student learning and success—the centrality of this is the motivator
* Excitement of new ideas
* Data—having the data that showed the need to improve was the motivator

Energize and excite (\*)[[1]](#footnote-1)

* FIGs $ (\*) (FIG models allow continuing and sustaining work; professional development is the chance to bring in outside resources)
* Professional development $-$$$
* Group activities and retreats $-EEE
* Valuing and including adjuncts $ (initial stipend) (\*)(\*)

Sustaining effort and avoiding burnout

* Creating and maintaining a collective identity and purpose
* (both campus and statewide)
* attending conferences $$-$$$ (particularly the RPM conferences with like-minded people)
* rotating leadership $$ (release time)—an alternative view is that one consistent person is effective
* realistic goal and timeline
* culture that allows us to find what does not work; fail; reset goals
* being heard, valued and appreciated
* collaboration that leads to visible results that is productive—tied to release time $$

Skeptics and naysayers

* It’s about the students (\*)(\*)—show them the numbers
* Time, patience and the chance to safely try (\*)
* Opportunities for baby steps for moving forward eg use one CAT, use clicker questions
* Meet them where they are
* Focus on hiring new faculty activists

**2) Decision making processes**

Transparent: clearly articulated decision-making process. This process has to be facilitated by a person (dept head, coordinator) who is committed to making the process work and takes responsibility for it (training of facilitators) $$$

Inclusive decision making with intentional invites and solicited opinions that are valued and respected especially ones who have traditionally been excluded i.e. adjuncts (\*)(\*)(\*) $$ for adjunct participation

* *How would you use a protocol with this? Have protocols been used?[[2]](#footnote-2)*

Disseminated/delegated model: (DTF—disappearing task force) $ for adjunct participation

* Question is posed
* Task force formed—disappearing—meeting times and locations published
* Discussion takes place leading to recommendation
* Vote

(antidote to “strategic non-decision-making”)

low-risk gatherings to promote collegiality and scholarship of teaching (\*)

reflection Friday

math and munch

department retreats

* *helps build the background culture of trust that makes future decisions possible*

$$--department retreats, adjuncts

Decisions became possible when discussions were based on evidence rather than anecdotes or beliefs $-$$ based on IR capacity or faculty stipend for liason with IR (\*)

* *Anecdotes can help form Q’s that can be researched—data collected*
* *Distinction emerged between “being against” and “not standing in the way of something”*

*“Cutting military spending and using it to fund education…priceless”*

**3) Inducting (New)Bees**

Ongoing faculty collaboration on improving student understanding e.g. classroom practices, classroom exchanges, core materials--$$$ if this is a department-based activity--*framed by an evidence based culture*

* + PT and FT have a voice—*respected for professional judgment*
  + Separate/distinct from dept. meetings

Orientation and mentoring--$$ if you are going to train mentors and do orientations

* + Mentoring relationship ends, and transitions to an ongoing collaboration (\*)

*Value the experience that faculty new to the college bring*

*Two-way learning*

*Building professional relationships*

*Non-political mentoring*

*Training for mentors?*

* + Clearly communicating departmental expectations re: student learning outcomes, core material

*Orientation includes a check list created by dept*

*Could be served by having a course coordinator*

Toolbox of resources with *guidance* in context of student learning/core materials, e.g. syllabi, activities, course calendars, assessments, etc (\*)--$$ if you want to do quality work in the way suggested here—stipends for creating materials for tool box

*The guidance is crucial. The tools alone are not effective and can in fact fail spectacularly.*

*WAMAP task library (tasks here have implementation guidance)*

**4) Administrators**

Administrators and instructors speak different languages—faculty need to navigate the difference (\*)(\*)

* + *What are the different languages?*
  + *Different languages, different value systems, or different jobs?*
  + *Need to navigate ongoing relationship not just when asking for money*

Support should be defined in specific ways (by faculty) (\*)

* *Financial, visible, resources*
  + *Admin support for scheduling classes, FIG meeting times, dept and division meetings, disseminating information to adjuncts*

Faculty should be proactive and propose things to administrators so that faculty are seen as experts with professional integrity.

* + *Be ready to make and defend your case*.
  + *Defend your case in terms of what administrators value and believe in.*
  + *Negotiating skills, networking—find people who get things done and see how they do it.*

Identifying key supporters is very important, but it does not stop there. *(Don’t just find one person that you focus on—go beyond that one supportive person to make multiple contacts.)*

* + *Also identify key road blocks and dissenters.*
  + *Invite administrators to classrooms or FIG meetings; they need their own stories to tell other administrators.*
  + *Student voices are needed.*
  + *Invite administrators to poster sessions presented by students*

**5) Department level data inquiry**

Include context when sharing data externally

* *What do you mean by context?*
* *Who is the external group?*
* *Data that is shared should be accompanied with a narrative explaining background and possible inferences*
* *Data if used correctly is good, but used incorrectly can be abused*
* *Financial impact of sharing data externally a factor to consider*

Department-driven data collection *and analysis (with expert support as needed)*

* *The types of data collected should be partially driven by faculty*
* *Faculty should help formulate questions and data should be in response*
* *Data presently for administrators; money needed to add urgency*

Advocate for changes to data collection system

* *The ability to disaggregate data at local level*
* *How can SBCTC provide the means to support departmental data inquiry that is useful for improving student learning?*
* *What kind of data can departments collect and what can SBCTC collect?*

Results by course, results by sequence: no one measure tells the whole story

* *Over a period of time*
* *Disaggregated data*

Collect different kinds of evidence, not just numerical data

* *Attitude surveys, student focus groups, measures of engagements, analysis of student work*

1. (\*) is the symbol used to denote the varied ways groups put stars on ideas that mattered most to them; not all groups used this annotation [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. italics represent comments added via sticky notes [↑](#footnote-ref-2)